



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,240	11/13/2003	Curtis Woods	12406/99	9480

26646 7590 11/17/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,240

Applicant(s)

WOODS ET AL.

Examiner

Omar Flores-Sánchez

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049,140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077).

Schafer et al. discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed including a housing (see col. 3, lines 10), a plurality of ticket bins 11, a transparent panel (see col. 3, lines 10), a bulkhead 32, a planar bottom 13, a pair of flanges (14 and 15), an angular wall 76, an arcuate guide 79. Schafer et al. does not show a plurality of drawers and a slot. However, Schafer teaches the use of a plurality of drawers 16 and for the purpose of displaying a plurality of different articles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the plurality of drawers as taught by Schick in order to obtain a device that display a plurality of different articles. Schafer et al. is capable of being in any position inside the drawers.

Regarding the slot, Robert et al. teaches the use of slots for the purpose of issuing the tickets in strings. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the slots as taught by Robert et al. in order to obtain a device that issues the tickets in strings.

3. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049,140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burr (5,222,624).

The modified device of Schafer et al. discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed except for a powered separator and a powered ticket transport mechanism. However, Burr teaches the use of a powered separator and a powered ticket transport mechanism (see Fig. 5) for the purpose of automatically dispensing tickets. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the powered separator and the powered ticket transport mechanism as taught by Burr in order to obtain a device that automatically dispenses tickets.

4. Claims 13-16, 19-22, 26-27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049,140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077) and Burr (5,222,624).

Schafer et al. discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed including a housing (see col. 3, lines 10), a plurality of ticket bins 11, a transparent panel (see col. 3, lines 10), a bulkhead 32, a planar bottom 13, a pair of flanges (14 and 15), an angular wall 76, an arcuate guide 79. Schafer et al. does not show a plurality of drawers, a slot, a powered separator and a powered ticket transport mechanism. Schafer et al. does not show a plurality of drawers and a slot. However, Schafer teaches the use of a plurality of drawers 16 and for the purpose of displaying a plurality of different articles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by

Art Unit: 3724

providing the plurality of drawers as taught by Schick in order to obtain a device that display a plurality of different articles. Schafer et al. is capable of being in any position inside the drawers.

Regarding the slot, Robert et al. teaches the use of slots for the purpose of issuing the tickets in strings. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the slots as taught by Robert et al. in order to obtain a device that issues the tickets in strings.

Regarding the powered separator and the powered ticket transport mechanism, Burr teaches the use of a powered separator and a powered ticket transport mechanism (see Fig. 5) for the purpose of automatically dispensing tickets. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the powered separator and the powered ticket transport mechanism as taught by Burr in order to obtain a device that automatically dispenses tickets.

5. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049,140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Osawa (6,527,129 B2).

The modified device of Schafer et al. discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed except for a plurality of sockets and tabs. Osawa teaches the use of a plurality of sockets 102 and tabs 112C for the purpose of quickly attaching different size products. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 3724

have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the plurality of sockets and tabs as taught by Osawa in order to obtain a device that quickly attaching different size products.

6. Claims 17-18 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049,140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077) and Burr (5,222,624) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Osawa (6,527,129 B2).

The modified device of Schafer et al. discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed except for a plurality of sockets and tabs. Osawa teaches the use of a plurality of sockets 102 and tabs 112C for the purpose of quickly attaching different size products. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Schafer et al. by providing the plurality of sockets and tabs as taught by Osawa in order to obtain a device that quickly attaching different size products.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Balgie is cited to show related device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Patent Examiner

11/13/06